

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/504,965	HOU ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph R. Pokrzywa	Art Unit 2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa. (3) _____.

(2) Kurt Berger. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11/17/04.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: BARKER ET AL (6,577,409)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed ways to overcome the current prior art, specifically, the examiner suggested adding a phrase "over a network" to the limitation to clearly define that the separation of the server and the client. This would overcome the rejection of Barker.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required